APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,347	07/02/2001	John M. Baron	10004912-1	8254

22879	7590	08/19/2005		

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 May 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _02 July 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Remarks received 05/31/2005.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 13 states "...in said second natural language..." where it should state "...in third natural language...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-3, 8-11, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by White, III et al. (6,493,661).

As to claims 1, 9 and 17, White III et al. teach:

creating a localization spreadsheet including:

storing in a first list of cells identifiers associated with alphanumeric strings to be included in a textual document;

storing in a second list of cells alphanumeric strings in a first natural language where each of said alphanumeric string is associated with respective ones of said identifiers;

storing in a third list of cells alphanumeric strings in a second natural language where each f said alphanumeric string in said second natural language is associated with respective ones of said identifiers;

storing in a fourth list of cells alphanumeric strings in a third natural language where each of said alphanumeric string in said third natural language is associated with respective ones of said identifiers; and

(Fig. 3 includes a spreadsheet for storing a first list of cells with an identifier, a second set of cells representing a text string in a first language, a third set of cells in a second language and a fourth set of cells in a third language, (col. 3, line 52 through col. 4, line 12);

creating the string table from said localization spreadsheet including said

identifiers and said alphanumeric strings of one of said natural languages (Fig. 3 depicts

a spreadsheet containing numerous smaller tables representing the replacement of a

text string into a different language).

As to claims 2 and 10, White III et al. teach generating a plurality of said string

tables wherein each string table includes said alphanumeric strings from the same list of

cells from said localization spreadsheet (Fig. 3, is a spreadsheet with tables containing

translations of different text strings into different languages).

As to claims 3, 11, and 19, White III et al. teach:

reading said string table using a computer table (software for text replacement,

col. 3, lines 54-56);

creating screens using said alphanumeric strings contained within said string

tables (in substituting for a text string, the entire text-replacement macro containing the

string can be replaced by static text, col. 4, lines 7-9); and

displaying said screens to a user of said computer program (the text strings are

replaced within an application to which a user is or would be using, Fig. 1, elements 13,

14, 16, and 17).

As to claim 8 and 16, White III et al. teach representing one of a menu, prompt and information exchange by said alphanumeric string (representing information to be exchanged by a text string, col. 3, lines 45-50).

As to claim 18, White III et al. teach using said string table within a main software routine to include a foreign language in an interfacing software program (substituting text segments of a different language into an application co. 3, lines 52-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 4-6, 12-14, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White III et al. as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of Hamann (6,092,036).

As to claims 4 and 12, White III et al. do not teach highlighting one of said identifier in response to a change made to a corresponding ones of said alphanumeric strings of one of said first and second natural languages.

However, Hamann teaches a user is able to edit the or add a new locality and when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update the text identifier if either of the text entries was edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, (col. 2, lines 9-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the spreadsheet of White III et al. with the indicating function of Hamann to create a data processing system having multi-lingual capability such that the data processing system can run in one ore more pre-defined target languages as well as the source language, as taught by Hamann (col. 1, lines 64-67).

As to claims 5, 13, and 20, White III et al. do not teach highlighting ones of said alphanumeric strings of one of said first and second natural language in response to a change made a corresponding one of said identifier.

However, Hamann teaches a user is able to edit the or add a new locality and when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update the text strings if either of the

text identifier was edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, (col. 2, lines 9-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the spreadsheet of White III et al. with the indicating function of Hamann to create a data processing system having multi-lingual capability such that the data processing system can run in one ore more pre-defined target languages as well as the source language, as taught by Hamann (col. 1, lines 64-67).

As to claims 6, 14, and 21, White III et al. do not teach highlighting, in response to a change made to one of said alphanumeric strings in said first natural language, a corresponding one of said alphanumeric strings of a second natural language.

However, Hamann teaches a user is able to edit the or add a new locality and when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter the locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update a text string if a corresponding text string was edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, (col. 2, lines 9-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the spreadsheet of White III et al. with the indicating function of Hamann to create a data processing system having multi-lingual capability

such that the data processing system can run in one ore more pre-defined target

languages as well as the source language, as taught by Hamann (col. 1, lines 64-67).

8.   Claims 7, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over White III et al. as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and further in view of

Hauduc et al. (6,904,401).

        As to claims 7, 15 and 22, White III et al. teach storing in a fifth list of cells (Fig. 3,

indicated by the "...")

        White III et al. do not teach an indicator that the corresponding cell in one or

more of the other said lists is selected for special treatment.

        However, Hauduc et al. teach using text string tables for providing localizable

applications where a selected language pack only translates the data within the

application that is sensitive to regional settings (col. 6, lines 1-4, 20-25). Where it would

be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the data that is not sensitive to regional

settings would be marked as so in the language pack, creating a data listed for special

treatment.

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of

the invention to combine the spreadsheet translations of White III et al. with the regional

settings of Hauduc et al. to enable the changing of formats of the elements that make-

up the content of the application in region-specific environment, as taught by Hauduc et

al. (col. 2, lines 15-20).

9.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White III

et al. in view of Hamann.

As to claims 23, White III et al. teach:

creating a localization spreadsheet:

storing in a first list of cells identifiers associated with alphanumeric strings to be

included in a textual document;

storing in a second list of cells alphanumeric strings in a first natural language

where each of said alphanumeric string is associated with respective ones of said

identifiers;

storing in a third list of cells alphanumeric strings in a second natural language

where each f said alphanumeric string in said second natural language is associated

with respective ones of said identifiers;

storing in a fourth list of cells alphanumeric strings in a third natural language

where each of said alphanumeric string in said third natural language is associated with

respective ones of said identifiers; and

(Fig. 3 includes a spreadsheet for storing a first list of cells with an identifier, a second

set of cells representing a text string in a first language, a third set of cells in a second

language and a fourth set of cells in a third language, (col. 3, line 52 through col. 4, line

12);

creating the string table from said localization spreadsheet including said

identifiers and said alphanumeric strings of one of said natural languages (Fig. 3 depicts

a spreadsheet containing numerous smaller tables representing the replacement of a

text string into a different language).

White III et al. do not teach:

identifying a change in either said identifier list or in any of said language lists

highlighting, in response to said identifying step, entries in the other lists, which

are associated with identified changes in a particular list.

However, Hamann teach:

identifying a change in either said identifier column or in any of said language

columns, (recognizing when the user edits or adds a new language information, alerting

the user to input the locality information, col. 6, lines 42-46).

highlighting (alerting the user through a dialog box), in response to said

identifying step, entries in the other columns which are associated with identified

changes in a particular column ((a user is able to edit the or add a new locality and

when a new information is entered, a dialog box appears notifying the user to enter the

locality identifier, (col. 6, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to not only alert the user when a locality

identifier is needed, but to also alert the user to update the columns corresponding to

the columns that had been edited, so that they system was able to more efficiently

translate the software without modifying the source as taught by Hamann, col. 2, lines

9-11)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the spreadsheet of White III et al. with the indicating function of Hamann to create a data processing system having multi-lingual capability such that the data processing system can run in one ore more pre-defined target languages as well as the source language, as taught by Hamann (col. 1, lines 64-67).

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
8/12/05

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER